

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A571

If we correctly read the thinking of the majority of the textile industry, most plant owners do not want to be put into the position of accepting a direct monetary subsidy from the Government.

Cutting off the \$42.50 per bale subsidy would put a lot of cotton growers out of business. The Winston-Salem, N.C., Journal and Sentinel recently pointed out that of 800,000 American cotton farmers, some 600,000 are small, marginal producers. As President Kennedy said, the average American farmer cannot, as yet, produce cotton profitably at world prices. The possible exception is some of the large, highly mechanized producers in Western States.

There also is talk of cotton handlers, or brokers, receiving the subsidy and they in turn would sell cotton to American mills approximately \$42.50 cheaper. This arrangement doesn't sound right and would be in for tough sledding in Congress.

Other possibilities have been advanced, all of which have bugs in them. Congress' responsibility is to do away with the inequitable differential, make prices on export cotton competitive on the world market, and at the same time avoid forcing the average American cotton farmer out of business. We hope there are some modern-day Solomons in the distinguished Halls of Congress.

A Tribute to Congressman Barratt O'Hara

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and deep respect that I rise today to add my voice to those who have praised Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, and his outstanding record of 50 years of public service.

His life and career have been brilliantly reviewed here in this Chamber, but I would like to say a few words today about BARRATT O'HARA, the man; a man I have been privileged to know.

It is impossible to grow up in Illinois these days without feeling the influence of this warmhearted and generous man who has become so much a part of the history and lifeblood of our State. His love for Illinois, his civic pride and great compassion for his fellow countrymen have been expressed throughout his life.

It has been said that a man's life is the sum of his knowledge and experience put to use. BARRATT O'HARA's eventful years have been scored by thousands of deeds and actions which eloquently bespeak the motivating philosophy of the man behind them. When I think of BARRATT O'HARA, I am always reminded of the saying that the difference between a dream and reality is action, action taken by a man of ability who is not willing to give less than the best of himself in any endeavor.

The State of Illinois, this House of Representatives, and our great land have increased in stature owing to the great contributions Mr. O'HARA has made to the true ideals of our Democratic process.

My own career in public life has been relatively brief, by comparison to the

years Congressman O'HARA has served the people. And it is particularly gratifying to know that, in a world which often scoffs at idealism, there are still those rare individuals, like BARRATT O'HARA, who can renew our faith in the future and our will to accept the problems thrust upon us by the times.

BARRATT O'HARA is ageless and of the ages. I am proud to be associated with this great man and to call him friend and colleague. On this 50th anniversary of his election to public office, I take the opportunity to wish him many more years of health so he can continue his impressive record of public service.

Siskin Memorial Center, Chattanooga, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Garrison and Mose Siskin of Chattanooga, Tenn., are two of the Nations most thoughtful and generous humanitarians. They organized and finance the Siskin Memorial Center, which is a \$4 million rehabilitation center at Chattanooga, which gives remarkable help to the lame, blind, and mentally handicapped. An article in the Washington Star of January 26, tells the reason Garrison became interested in this center.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF FAITH

In 1942 an accident caused a blood clot in Garrison Siskin's leg. Three surgeons told him they would have to amputate, gave him only a 50 percent chance of recovery. Garrison spent one whole night praying. He says, "I promised God, if I recovered, I would devote the rest of my life to helping people. I consider this a contract." The leg healed. There was no amputation. Garrison's brother Mose, his partner in a steel scrap business, was moved by Garrison's faith to work with him on his covenant with God. They started simply, helping a family made homeless by fire, helping a sick child, helping most anyone truly in need. Out of this modest beginning has arisen a \$4 million rehabilitation center in their hometown of Chattanooga, Tenn. A large part of this has been made possible from the profits of the Siskins' business. The center has a non-denominational chapel, a building serving religious, cultural, and educational groups, as well as the rehabilitation building. To the center come the blind, the lame, and other physically and mentally handicapped. None is turned away because of inability to pay. Thousands have been helped since the center opened in 1955. The Siskins are extending the scope of the center through the 365 Club, whose members contribute a penny a day. Garrison calls the center "Operation Crossroads" because it is the crossroads for those who pass through from a life of despair and pain to one of hope and fulfillment.

Next Door to the Cuban Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in yesterday's Evening Star there appeared an article written by one of the foremost news writers, Eric Sevareid, with respect to the Cuban situation. It was written from Key West. Not only was I impressed with the point he made, but I was particularly impressed with the statement of the need to go forward with a program with respect to Cuba. The program he suggested in this particular article was recognition of the Cuban government-in-exile. I have agreed with that point of view, so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT DOOR TO THE CUBAN TRAGEDY—EXILES WILL LIVE IN A STATE OF SUSPENSION TILL THEY KNOW THEY CAN RETURN OR NOT

(By Eric Sevareid)

KEY WEST.—This is where freedom comes to a point.

The southeastern tip of this southernmost fragment of the United States is a low stone seawall curving from the Navy installation, along the George Smathers public beach, past the Howard Johnson emporium, the long row of stabled fishing boats, and the Food Fair until Roosevelt Boulevard becomes Truman Avenue. At the corner of Truman Avenue and Margaret Street stands the Margaret Truman launderette.

Key West, part Spanish, part Anglo-American is an architectural mishmash of lovely, balconied New Orleans-style framed houses lost in a neon-lighted nightmare of gas stations, shops, and joints. The tourists are few, middle aged and middle western. Youth consists of pairs and trios of bored U.S. sailors drifting along Duval Street under the eye of the shore patrol. The cars move at sedate speeds, the pelicans glide very slowly and even gulls seem rarely to scream. It is the frequent jet fighter planes on patrol that supply the vigor and the sound.

The tip of freedom points toward Cuba which is closer than Miami, and easily penetrates the azure curtain of sea and sky. One has only to switch the television knob to channel 5 and Castro, communism, and the new songs of old Cuba, lyrics by ideologues, suddenly fill one's motel bedroom with clamor and tense reality. Nothing but the sea and the sky separate this place from the tragedy, ever present in the faces and the conversations of Cuban waiters, chambermaids, drivers, and fishermen all over this raddled spit of land.

From here the refugees are scattered, all the way up the keys, through and to the north of Miami, their mecca of desperation, their gathering and their festering place. There the complete agony is assembled out of its tens of thousands of human parts—the pride, the soulsickness, the blind but urgent hopes, the shapeless plans to somehow plan. The joy over the returned heroes of the Bay of Pigs was short lived; the fiery, promising words of President Kennedy in the Miami Stadium faded from the conversation or are repeated in ironic echoes. The demurrer of the Attorney General on the

question of the air support came like a whip-lash in their faces.

The fact that they may be truly lost is beginning to penetrate. They are a passionate people; they speak their bitterness as readily as they spoke their gratitude. The State of Florida and the Federal Government have an enormous and growing problem on their hands. Every living Cuban here asks himself and his friends the daily question, spoken or unspoken: Are we going back? There is no answer. If an official answer does come and it is affirmative, with evidence to support it, they will remain together and live only for the day of their return. If the answer is negative, they would explode, but sooner or later they would begin to dull the pain and to think in terms of assimilation to North American life. One way or another, their life would go on with some meaning and purpose. But today they exist in a state of suspension, their feet not on the ground nor their heads in the clouds. Prolonged, this will prove unendurable.

The other side of this coin is the dilemma of the U.S. Government. It can issue general assurances, as the President did in Miami, but it cannot support the assurance with public proof of specific plans. There is a difference between an official attitude and an official policy. For this slowly festering pool of displaced humanity there in Florida an attitude very soon will not be enough. A positive policy, even if short of armed invasion, but promising a specific schedule of pressures severe enough to realistically foreshadow Castro's downfall, would seem to justify the idea of a Cuban government in exile, for a host of useful purposes, including Cuban cohesion in Florida now and limiting the anarchy and fraternal violence in Cuba later.

It would also permit and inspire serious advance thinking here about the nature of the post-Castro Cuban political and social order. It is these formulations for the future that responsible Cubans here now wish to get on with. It is a new vision of Cuban life in liberty and social justice, thought out in some detail, that ought to be crackling through the airwaves now, to the ears of all within that island fortress. They ought to hear it night after night, as they now hear the mechanical drumbeat of communism's slogans, insults, and alibis. Where the vision is unstated, as where there is no vision, people perish, whether in their homes or abroad and seeking to find their homes.

Texas Loses a Dedicated Public Servant in Warren McDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texas State Senator Warren McDonald, of Tyler, passed away on November 26, 1962. He had served as assistant Smith County attorney, and served for three terms as Smith County attorney. He was a naval officer in World War II, and was a State senator from the Tyler district of eight east Texas counties, from 1951 to 1959.

In an era of blackout for good government at the State level in Texas, he stood up and fought for justice and progress in the traditions of Govs. Jim

Hogg, "the Great Commoner," and O. M. Roberts, "the Old Alcalde," who, like Warren McDonald, came from Tyler, Tex.

Some of Warren McDonald's ancestors fought for independence in the American Revolution, others signed the Texas Declaration of Independence, another fell at the Alamo.

Warren McDonald was an unselfish patriot. He never used the prestige of his office to advance his own financial interests. He traveled with me over the counties in his district. The people of his district knew and trusted him. He loved them. Tyler and Texas have suffered a serious loss, in losing one of the most dedicated men to come out of Tyler in this generation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article and editorial: "Ex-Senator McDonald Dies Here," from the Tyler Morning Telegraph of November 27, 1962, and "Warren S. McDonald" from the Tyler Courier-Times of November 29, 1962.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Morning Telegraph, Nov. 27, 1962]

EX-SENATOR McDONALD DIES HERE

Warren S. McDonald, 55, former Smith County attorney and State senator, died in a Tyler hospital Monday afternoon after a long illness.

Funeral services will be held at 10:30 a.m. Wednesday at Glenwood Methodist Church with the Rev. James Lee Riley, pastor, officiating, assisted by Dr. Walter Kerr. Burial will be in Rose Hill Cemetery under direction of Lloyd James Funeral Home.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Gertrude Talbert McDonald of Tyler; one son, George Warren (Mike) McDonald of Tyler; one daughter, Mrs. William P. Riddick of Corpus Christi; one brother, G. J. McDonald of Tyler; two sisters, Mrs. Helen Barham of Scarsdale, N.Y.; Lt. Col. Mary G. McDonald of Washington, D.C., and five grandchildren.

Pallbearers will be R. P. Power, Milton Greer Mall, Lester Heiser, J. G. Powers, Eugene Talbert, Jim Sid Johnson, Royall Brown, T. Lamar Johnson and William L. Gunn.

Honorary pallbearers are Ses Haynes, Murph Wilson, Sam Bright, Dillard LaRue, Earl Andrews, Roy Pair, George Nokes, Ned Price, John Allen, W. B. Connally, M. J. Harvey Sr., the Board of Stewards of Glenwood Methodist Church and members of the Lamar S. Clark Sunday School Class.

Mr. McDonald, who resided at 526 S. Chilton, was born in Tyler.

A Navy veteran of World War II, he served in the Judge Advocate's office.

He was graduated from John Tyler High School in 1925, attended Tyler Junior College and played on the college's first football team. Later he attended the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., and received his law degree from the University of Texas where he was a member of Sigma Nu fraternity.

A member of Marvin Methodist Church for many years, he was a former member of the board of trustees of that church and past president of the Friendly Class. Mr. McDonald helped organize and start Glenwood Methodist Church. He later joined Glenwood Methodist Church and was a member of the church's official board at the time of death. He taught the Lamar S. Clark Sunday School Class at Glenwood until he became ill.

He was a former assistant Smith County attorney and served three terms as county at-

torney. He served two terms in the Texas State Senate, from 1951 to 1959. While in the senate, he headed a number of important committees and he was active in locating the East Texas Tuberculosis Hospital in Smith County. He was instrumental in giving Tyler and Smith Counties the chance to participate in the Upper Neches River Authority.

He belonged to St. John's Masonic Lodge No. 53 and was a member of Knights of Pythias.

A past president of the Tyler Lions Club, he was secretary for the Smith County Bar Association and was a director of the county bar association at the time of death.

Mr. McDonald was on the local board of directors of the American Cancer Society. He helped organize the Tyler Junior Chamber of Commerce and was one of its first presidents. Also, he helped organize the Tyler Little Theater.

Some of his ancestors fought in the American Revolution and at the Alamo, and some were signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence.

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Courier-Times, Nov. 29, 1962]

WARREN S. McDONALD

Warren S. McDonald's lifespan covered little more than a half century, but if life is reckoned in terms of worthy deeds, his earthly sojourn was a long one in achievements.

He served this area 8 years as State senator. Earlier he served well as assistant Smith County attorney and then as county attorney. He was active in the county and State bar associations and in numerous community and civic organizations. He gave generous support and leadership to church work and had a leading part in establishing a new Tyler church, Glenwood Methodist, where he taught a Sunday school class and served on the board until illness disabled him. He belonged to the Masonic and Pythian fraternities.

In these alliances, in his legal profession, and in warm personal friendship, he served many of all classes, colors, and creeds. He was deeply sympathetic to the needs of people and he often went the Biblical second mile in giving aid and helping others overcome their difficulties.

The sorrow over his death is eased in the minds of many by memories of the good deeds that enriched the life of Warren S. McDonald.

Dave Marion Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. MCGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, Senators are especially proud of their home States and are not bashful about describing them. However, there are times when we feel a special pride that develops from some special deed or event back home.

Today I would like to describe something that has made me really proud to represent Wyoming. In this case the action resulted from a tragedy. A young student at the University of Wyoming, a star football player, was severely injured when a pistol used in a hunting expedition accidentally discharged. Mr. President, the bullet severed the spinal

1963

izing Carl M. Schultz and Gerald E. Gotsch to appear and testify as witnesses in the case of the *United States v. Thomas H. Keegan*, criminal action No. 61-Cr-487, in the northern district of Illinois, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXPRESSON OF SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATIVE TO SUPPORTING THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE'S EFFORTS TO OBTAIN A FREE WORLD EMBARGO ON SOVIET SHIPMENTS TO CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Morse) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 83) to express the sense of the Senate relative to supporting the American merchant marine's efforts to obtain a free world embargo on Soviet shipments to Cuba, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIX TO ADD A NEW PARAGRAPH RELATIVE TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MORSE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 84) to amend rule XIX to add a new paragraph relative to Members of the House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

ORDERING CERTAIN MATTER EXPUNGED FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. MORSE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 85) ordering certain matter expunged from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSIDERATION OF OWNERSHIP OF RADIO OR TELEVISION STATION BY MEMBER OF CONGRESS IN AWARD OF BROADCAST LICENSES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides that ownership or part ownership of a radio or television station by a Member of Congress shall not be considered as a favorable factor in the award of broadcast licenses.

The Federal Communications Commission has in the past justified the award of a lucrative television channel

in part on the ground that stockholders of the company were Members of Congress. This was held to give the applicant an edge in the civic participation criterion—one of the yardsticks used by the FCC in deciding contested cases.

I sharply disapprove of this criterion. Members of Congress have great authority over the FCC. They enact its basic law, provide the annual appropriations, and, in the case of Senators, confirm the appointment of the Commissioners.

To specifically favor an application because a Congressman participates in it could turn into a form of "payola." We in Congress benefit from the practice. It is up to us to end it.

The FCC itself, dependent as it is on Congress, cannot be expected to reverse a policy so favorable to Senators and Congressmen, unless Congress acts. Silence by Congress on this subject means that the special advantage to Congressmen in the award of lucrative broadcast franchises will continue.

I do not expect the Commission to reverse this decision on its own. Rather, it is my view that Congress has a clear, immediate responsibility to state a firm policy against giving favorable weight to ownership or pecuniary interest by a Member of Congress in a broadcasting firm.

My bill does not prohibit Members of Congress from ownership or participation in television or radio stations; but it does prevent such ownership from favorably influencing the FCC.

I introduced a similar measure in 1960, at which time the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the chairman of the Communications Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, indicated on the floor that hearings would be held if the bill were introduced again. My present action is in response to that understanding.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 708) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the consideration of construction permit and station license applications where certain interests of Members of Congress are involved, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron and steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates. As the law now stands, polished stainless steel sheets and plates properly dutiable at 14 percent are subject to a duty of less than 3 percent simply as a result of the polishing process, which places them under a different paragraph of the Tariff Act. This situation creates a serious import problem for U.S. producers of stainless steel and their employees and poses

the threat of substantial economic injury to these domestic firms.

Since the discovery of this tariff loophole, importation of stainless steel plates and sheets has increased tremendously, by more than 1,000 percent since 1960. Japan is by far the greatest source of these polished metal plates and sheets, accounting for well over 90 percent of the imports during the first 10 months of 1962.

The Tariff Commission has already seen the unreason of this loophole and has done away with it in its new series of tariff schedules. Congress authorized the proclamation of these tariff schedules early last year; when the President implements this act, the schedules will have the force of law. However, this implementation has been unavoidably delayed.

The schedules must conform to trade agreements, and therefore the whole matter depends upon successful negotiation with principal foreign nations. There is no way in which U.S. steel producers can know when this loophole will be closed. Yet, during this time, foreign polished sheets and plates will continue to pour into this country in increasing amounts.

Mr. President, there is ample precedent for this type of protective legislation as, for example, Public Law 749, 83d Congress, and Public Law 454, 85th Congress. Furthermore, the proposed amendment does not create a discriminatory duty against foreign suppliers. The current import duty on polished stainless steel sheets is 15 percent in Japan herself.

Mr. President, this bill is necessary to protect this segment of our domestic industry from unwarranted harm.

I hope that my bill will meet with a favorable response in this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, and that the bill may lie on the table for 10 days so that other Senators may, if they wish, join in cosponsoring the bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 719) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U.S.C. title 19, sec. 1001) be amended by striking out "sheets and plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated, 1½ cents per pound" and also by striking out "other than polished planished, or glanced, herein provided for."

Sec. 2. This Act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

PREVENTION OF THE USE OF PERFORMANCE-STANDARDS OPERATIONS AND MEASURING DEVICES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs, or other performance-standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service. These measurements and programs are referred to as guidelines in the postal service.

The Department maintains that it is attempting to improve efficiency and to reduce operating costs—both of which objectives I applaud. But the operation of the guidelines system is actually destructive of employee morale and works against a most efficient and economical Post Office Department.

Testimony before a House subcommittee revealed that during a recent Christmas rush in 1 community, 14 distribution clerks were denied overtime pay because they had allegedly not met the minimum standards. Among those 14, 1 man had been seriously injured on duty and had not yet fully recovered, while others were older employees who were unable to meet the standards.

Pennsylvania postal workers have told me that the guidelines system fails to take into account the human element and, as one said just yesterday, "we can't explain our problems to a punched card."

They add that this system has increased the amount of nightwork and is sacrificing accuracy for speed. They complain of added tension on the job, dissension among the postal workers, and poor management-employee relations.

My bill would completely eliminate the guidelines system because I believe that it fails in its objectives and is basically detrimental to the postal service and the general public interest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 720) to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs, or other performance-standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RETIREMENT FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to adjust the retirement annuities of Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties by increasing the computation factor from 2 to 2½ percent. This bill is the same as S. 1850 of the 87th Congress, which I introduced.

This bill is in behalf of those Federal employees whose occupations are deemed hazardous because their duties require contact with criminals. This class of employees includes FBI men, prison guards, border patrol inspectors, and other similarly occupied law enforcement officers. Formerly, the special circumstances of these employees' jobs was

recognized in the Retirement Act, and there was available to them an extra one-half percent differential in the computation factor used in computing annuities. This larger factor was designed to afford them an equitable annuity rate at an earlier age than other Federal employees. The differential was in recognition of the extra hazards they normally faced in their employment, the extra demands thus made on their physical and mental health, and the general need for encouraging the filling of law-enforcement positions by younger, vigorous men. However, in revising the Retirement Act in 1956, Congress destroyed the differential rate by raising the general computation factor to 2 percent; thus the need for this legislation to restore the differential.

Hearings on this subject were held by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in 1961, and revealed a variety of opinions on this subject. In introducing this bill again in the same form as before, I do not foreclose from consideration possible amendments which have been suggested, such as increasing these employees' contribution rate, or instituting a lower mandatory retirement age. There is also the need for special consideration for the Federal Aviation Agency's air traffic controllers, who are subject to equivalent stress to that experienced by the law enforcement groups. I am hopeful some consideration can be given to all these problems this year, and legislation worked out to meet the need for special recognition of these employees who so nobly perform these especially difficult jobs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 722) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT, RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX, RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, AND TEMPORARY EXTENDED RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS ACTS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961. This bill follows the draft of the proposal made by the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board in a letter addressed to the President of the Senate which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The railroad retirement system and the railroad unemployment insurance system have always made up the complete retirement and insurance program

for the railroad industry, which is separate and distinct from other public and private systems of this kind. The programs are financed mainly by taxes levied on railroad payrolls. The taxes supporting the railroad system are borne by employer and employee alike in equal amounts whereas the taxes financing the unemployment insurance system are paid by the employer alone. The severe deterioration in levels of railroad employment and payrolls over the past number of years is a matter which is only too well known to all of us. Among its far-reaching consequences is a heavy loss in tax revenues to the railroad retirement and railroad insurance systems.

This has caused a reduction in the rate of increase in the retirement reserve which in turn has had the effect of cutting into the interest income which had been projected by the actuaries in the establishment of the financial structure for the entire system. A reexamination of the actuarial condition of the railroad retirement program in the light of this development has established that the program has been operating with an actuarial deficit for a number of years amounting to about 1.79 percent of taxable payroll or \$77 million each year.

Comparable and related financial problems have been experienced in the administration of the unemployment insurance system which also has been affected by the marked decline in the levels of railroad employment and by the resulting loss of tax revenue. Coincident to this decrease in employment is a corresponding increase in claims for unemployment benefits as unemployment among railroad workers increased. The simple fact is that these factors have created an actual deficit of about \$300 million in the railroad unemployment insurance system in addition to the actuarial deficit in the retirement program.

When this condition was first noted, President Kennedy directed the Railroad Retirement Board to reappraise the systems and to develop recommendations for legislative changes designed to strengthen and improve the financial condition which I have described. The bill which I am introducing represents many months of careful study by the Railroad Retirement Board in response to the President's direction, and it is designed by it as the most effective way to remedy the deficiencies which I have touched upon.

The remedial action proposed by the Board which is in accord with the administration program would include the following steps:

First. Provide for the investment of the railroad retirement funds, which are now in an amount of almost \$4 billion, at a rate equal to the average market yield of all outstanding U.S. marketable obligations rather than at the 3-percent interest rate now charged. At the present time the average market yield is about 3¾ percent, or considerably in excess of the 3-percent rate paid at this time.

Second. Increase the tax base for taxable and creditable purposes under both the railroad retirement and the rail-

I have been advised today, as I have made some brief research, that the tradition of not reflecting upon Members of the other body is a historic one. There are many instances in which, in the course of debate, what has been said in the Senate or in the other body in respect to Members of the two Houses has resulted in the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore taking the matter up with the other body and having the comments expunged from the Record.

Quite frankly, I was of the opinion that probably the rules would cover the question. But I found the following when I went into a study of Senate procedure, as found on page 264 of the manual entitled "Senate Procedure," which book was written by our two very able Parliamentarians, Charles Watkins and his Assistant Parliamentarian, Mr. Riddick:

There is no standing rule of the Senate relating to comments upon proceedings of the House of Representatives, although such a provision is contained in Jefferson's Manual.

Jefferson's Manual not having been adopted as a part of the rules of the Senate, a Senator has the right to refer to proceedings in the House of Representatives, provided it is done in parliamentary language.

The rule in Jefferson's Manual is not actually regarded by the Senate as a question of order, but rather as a question of propriety or impropriety, and the Presiding Officer on one occasion expressed a reluctance to call a Senator to order for that alone where there was no breach of a positive rule of the Senate.

The Presiding Officer (in 1913) expressed the opinion that as a self-governing body it was for the Senate to determine how far Senators might go in commenting upon language used in the other body.

Under the precedents, however, it has been held not in order in debate for a Senator to make reference to action by the House of Representatives to read an extract from the proceedings of the House relating to a matter under discussion, to read from a speech made by a Member of the House during that particular Congress on the pending subject, or to make reference to the proceedings in the House on the matter under consideration for the purpose of influencing the action of the Senate.

It is out of order, as interfering with the independence of the two Houses, to allude to what has been done in the other House as a means of influencing the judgement of the one in which a question is pending.

It has been held that "it was not competent for a Senator to make reference" to the House of Representatives, or to criticize that body.

References in debate to the proceedings of the House of Representatives are out of order, and a Senator called to order for a violation can only proceed in order on motion.

It has been held out of order in debate for a Senator to refer to the proceedings in the House, to read from the House proceedings as published in the Record, as ruled in 1923, or to refer to proceedings relating to action on a bill.

It is also a violation of the privilege to refer to the individual character or to the acts or conduct of Members of that body.

It has been held out of order for a Senator to make references to Members of the House, to refer to a Member of the House by name to criticize the action of the Speaker, or to refer in debate to a Member of the

House in opprobrious terms or to impute to him unworthy motives.

The reading of a telegram being interrupted by a point of order that it reflected upon a Member of the House of Representatives, the objectionable language by unanimous consent was stricken from the Record.

In connection with the consideration of a resolution authorizing an inquiry into the failure of the Speaker of the House of Representatives to take prompt action on a Senate joint resolution passed by the Senate, the Vice President held that it was in the discretion of Senators as to what they might or might not say about proceedings in the House, provided they do not speak disrespectfully.

The House of Representatives, in a message to the Senate, characterized certain language by a Senator in debate as being improper, unparliamentary, and a reflection on the character of one of its Members; the Senate, subsequently, upon the request of that Senator, ordered the language expunged from the permanent Record.

On another occasion, the Senate never took any action on such a House-passed resolution—the resolution alleged that certain language used by a Senator concerning a Member of the House was a reflection on him, and requested that the Senate take appropriate action in connection therewith.

A resolution of the Senate declaring that certain language used by a Member of the House in debate concerning a Senator was unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, thus constituting a breach of privilege, was returned by the House on the ground that the resolution itself was a breach of privilege; the House, however, subsequently expunged from the permanent Record the remarks to which the Senate took exception.

Mr. President, these are the findings of our Parliamentarians as to the precedents and the history of the Senate. On the basis of those precedents I believe that the speech of my friend from Delaware yesterday would have been subject to a point of order, and had I been here I would have raised a point of order at least for a determination of the issue. It is too late now, because the speech is in the Record, and the only way that it can be taken out of the Record now, as the Parliamentarians advise me, is to have the Senate adopt a resolution for the expungement from the Record of that speech.

Mr. President, I have visited many parliamentary bodies in the world, and there are many differences between the Congress of the United States and parliamentary bodies elsewhere in the world. One of the greatest differences and one of the most important differences, and one of the reasons why in my judgment this system of legislative representation works, is that historically debate in the House and debate in the Senate never takes the form of reflecting upon the character and the reputation of Members of either body.

Of course, it can be said that not even Senators or Members of the House should be above criticism in debate in Congress. There is some merit to that argument.

Yet we must look at values and compare values. If we start the practice we will, in my judgment, get into a situation of personal, nasty debate that one can hear in many parliamentary bodies around the world, which in my judgment

destroys the effectiveness of such parliamentary bodies.

There is nothing that prevents a Senator or Member of the House, outside the Halls of Congress, if he believes a situation regarding the conduct or activity of a Member of Congress is such that it should be called to public attention, to discuss it out of the precincts of Congress.

What concerns me is, What is going to happen if we start a practice in Congress whereby a Senator can rise on the floor and express his disrespects for the Members of the House, and a Member of the House can rise and express his disrespect for the Members of the Senate? What is that going to do to legislative efficiency? What is that going to do to orderly debate? What is that going to do to keeping effective the legislative process in this great parliamentary body, the greatest in the world?

I believe it is a mistake to permit such a precedent to live on. I respectfully say that it is not in keeping with the historic debate practice in Congress. That is all I am going to say. I have made my point. Each Senator will have to judge for himself.

I send to the desk, as I close, a resolution—Senate Resolution 85—for appropriate reference, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the matter appearing in the daily issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5 (legislative day, January 15), 1963, beginning on page 1673, at the top of the second column, under the caption "The Administration Has Been Shoveling Out the Taxpayers' Money to Congressman ADAM POWELL," and extending down to and including so much of the second column on page 1675 as precedes the matter entitled "The New York City Newspaper Strike," be, and it is hereby, ordered to be expunged from the Record.

I also send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a resolution proposing an amendment to rule XIX, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That rule XIX be amended to add a new paragraph at the end thereof, as follows:

"8. No Senator in debate shall by any form of words impute to any Member of the House of Representatives any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Representative."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. In closing, I say to my good friend from Delaware that my difference with him is certainly not a personal difference; it is a professional difference. I am sure he will admit that I am just as sincere in my conviction on my side of the issue, as he will now discover, as he is sincere on his side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, and I certainly appreciate his sincerity. I know of no better way to display and illustrate this great fellowship than to ask that instead of having his resolution referred to a committee where it will die, we get immediate action on

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1825

sponsorship of the resolution. I should be delighted to join him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I must say to my friend that I would have come to him, but I had it ready for discussion. I wanted to wait until the order came from the White House. I have been reading every day that it was on its way, and I took this opportunity to get the floor to speak. I assure the Senator there is no one I would rather have as a cosponsor than my friend from Oregon. He and I last August had a colloquy in this regard, and perhaps even earlier.

This can be done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator knows that my comment about cosponsorship was made facetiously; but, in all seriousness, I shall be honored to join the Senator from Washington as cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope we can pass this fast. I am sure the Senate will agree, because it will be of great help in taking care of the problem.

There have been 45 instances of this action in the period of December. I do not know how many there are now.

These come from our allies, not from bloc countries. These are allies; people who stand up and say, "We are 110 percent with you on this Cuban matter."

It seems to me something ought to be done about it. It can be done. All they have to do is what the President of the United States is going to do or has done, perhaps, by this hour today; which is to say, "If you stop in Cuba, either coming or going, you cannot pick up cargoes in our ports."

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This may not be the whole answer to the problem, but it surely represents one step which will do a great deal to achieve our objective, or what we hope will be our grand objective in this area.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with my colleague from Washington, and I agree with his resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATOR TO SIGN CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to sign the cloture motion which was placed at the desk by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSAL TO EXPUNGE REMARKS BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE ON FEBRUARY 5, 1963, FROM PERMANENT CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of my good friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]—and I use the phrase "good

friend" advisedly and sincerely—for I rise to discuss a delicate matter. I wish to assure the Senator from Delaware that at no time during the discussion, nor at any time after the discussion, will there be any diminution of my very sincere affection and friendship for him.

But I rise to take exception to a speech made on the floor of the Senate yesterday by the Senator from Delaware. It contained, in my opinion, such a serious imputation against the character and reputation of a colleague on the House side that in my judgment the speech should not stand, at least without a protest. It should not, in my judgment, stand as a precedent.

Therefore, before finishing my remarks, I shall offer an amendment to Senate rule XIX, and I shall offer a resolution to expunge the speech of the Senator from Delaware on yesterday from the permanent record of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have spoken previously with the Senator from Delaware. He is aware that I am going to express these views.

Many people may not know that in this body there are many friendships. I know of no friendship between two men in this body which is based on deeper roots of mutual respect—and I speak for myself, but I take the liberty of speaking for the Senator from Delaware also—than the friendship which exists between the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the senior Senator from Oregon. It is a friendship that has existed from the time we first came into the Senate, up until today, and it is going to continue to exist so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned.

The Senator from Delaware and I have differed many times on issues in the Senate. We often have good-natured conversations about our differences. We have a difference on this matter, and unfortunately the difference goes to what some may say is a matter of delicacy in the Senate, but our differences are sincere.

The Senator from Delaware has made clear to me that he does not intend to expunge his speech from the Record, and I respect his attitude.

There is no question about this man's courage, sincerity, and high principles. In fact, I wish to say that the contributions the Senator from Delaware has made over the years by frequently calling to the attention of the Senate and of the country various evidences of malfeasance and corruption and wrongdoing in the administration of government is his own monument—and it is a great monument; it is a monument to this man's record and reputation that is going to live long after he ceases to be alive on this planet.

I can say nothing more, Mr. President, it seems to me, to show my high regard and deep respect for the Senator from Delaware.

On this matter I find myself in unalterable disagreement with the policy that I think is inherent in the precedent, that the Senator from Delaware established yesterday in his speech. In my judgment, no one can read it without coming

to the conclusion that it is a speech which in part at least does reflect upon the character and reputation of a colleague over on the House side.

I am not going to speak at any great length, but I am going to start my discussion by calling attention to rule XIX of the Senate, to be found on page 20 of the Senate Manual. I will read section 2 of it, which is relevant and pertinent to my remarks:

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators, any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Section 3 reads:

No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

I do not think there is any question that, if the speech on yesterday by my good friend from Delaware had been made about a Senator of the United States, he would have been subject to a point of order. I am not sure that a point of order could have been sustained against the speech he made yesterday. I would have tried it had I been here, in order to get a ruling from the Chair, through the Parliamentarian; but I was not here and therefore no point of order can be raised at the present time. The only way the point of view I express could be effectuated into action would be through a resolution of expunction, which I propose to make at the conclusion of my statement here this afternoon.

If Senators are thus protected by a rule of order in the Senate, under rule XIX, I think it is only fair and proper and within the spirit of comity that the same protection should be guaranteed to Members of the House. This is not a question of black or white. I fully realize there is a public interest involved, but there are procedures, Mr. President—parliamentary procedures—to be taken in case it is decided that the course of conduct of a Member of Congress is so improper that the public interest calls for action in respect to that conduct.

Speaking hypothetically, let us take the Senate. If the course of conduct of a Senator becomes such that, in the opinion of a Member of this body, or several Members of this body, it is unbecoming a Senator, the parliamentary procedure to follow is the submission of a resolution of censure. But it is hoary with tradition that each body of the Congress is the judge of its own Members and their conduct, and it is traditional that Members of the Senate do not utter statements in debate on the floor of the Senate that impugn the motives, characters, or reputations of Members of the other body.

It is historic that, when it has happened in debate, the Speaker of the House has called the attention of the President pro tempore of the Senate to the fact that such statements had been made. The President pro tempore of the Senate then, acting through the majority leader and the minority leader, usually sought to get the Senator who made the speech voluntarily to expunge the speech from the Record.

partment are very sincere about this problem. Many other governments are also. We in the Senate should make an effort to gather together all of those in the free world who wish to engage in the endeavor to do something about the problem, and back them up.

Mr. President, I intend today to introduce a resolution. As the Secretary of State has pointed out, there has been some voluntary compliance. But a great many countries are still "dragging their heels." They want to do business as usual. For the life of me I cannot see how such countries can countenance the commerce in which they are engaged on the one hand and then go to great forums in the world and exchange diplomatic notes telling us they are wholeheartedly behind us in our attempt to rid Castro from the Western Hemisphere.

Many such countries have cooperated. But, Mr. President, over 2,500 ships, many of which are American-built and American-owned, fly the Liberian or Panamanian flag. Those ships are under no control. Many of them have been stopping in Cuba. I suppose many have cargoes of aviation fuel and other products that we do not want in Cuba.

There is absolutely no control over them. As of this morning, the best information I have is that South American countries other than Panama—and I must confess that they have not much control over the ships themselves after the ships get the Panamanian flag—but other South American countries have not been using their ships contrary to the order. However, they have not yet clamped down on the operations of ships that come to their ports from other parts of the world, having previously stopped at Cuba, or having picked up cargo in Cuba.

What we can do about such runaway ships flying foreign flags I do not know. We have been trying to do something about them for years. The operation is nothing but legalized tax evasion. American companies tell us that the ships are flying the flag deliberately so that they might pile up profits in Panama. Though the companies are not actually based in Panama, they may have a bank account in that country and can bring in their profits during the most propitious year for them.

Many companies follow that practice in order to avoid safety regulations. Many do it to get cheap labor. Yet we are trying to do something about companies whose ships fly those foreign flags. We are attempting to bring them under control, so that a responsible government can say to them, "You shall not go to Cuba; if you do so, you cannot enter an American port or a port in any other part of the free world."

We must do a great deal more about that situation. I do not know the answer. I hope that compliance will come voluntarily. Then we can accomplish the kind of isolation that we intend in that particular field.

We get very little help from the Defense Department on this problem. Every time we try to get some help in our effort to build up the American flag

on the high seas as contrasted with the runaway operation of companies who fly foreign flags, we are told by the Department that, as a question of defense, those ships are under our effective control. If something should happen, those ships would immediately come home. Most of them are American-owned. They are owned by American corporations.

For example, I do not know that there is effective control of a tanker in the Red Sea, flying the Panamanian flag with a Greek crew and Italian officers, if something should happen. We know that the merchant marine is the fourth arm of our defense. One facet of a solution that the Government should be working on is the endeavor to get those countries whose leaders profess they are part of the free world to say to owners of ships flying their flags, "If you have the protection of our flag, whatever it may be, you are going to adhere to it or we will take the flag away from you."

Mr. President, perhaps the order to which I have referred has already been issued. We should make an effort to go farther than that order, in an effort to carry out what I think is almost the unanimous agreement of the Organization of American States.

There has been some good work on the part of the State Department in working with leaders in other countries. There has been a ban on air travel and communications with Cuba, and the extension of economic sanctions voted a year ago at the Uruguay Conference to halt all trade with Cuba. Then, of course, there should be a crackdown on ships that trade with Cuba. We should formulate a program of countermeasures against Castro's campaign of terrorism, sabotage, and subversion throughout the continent.

In an effort to help out on this broad objection upon which we are embarked, I introduce the following resolution. I hope the Senate will agree to it quickly. It will help the President and the State Department, and will be an expression of opinion to the free world. It is something that we should do right now in order to do the things that need to be done or are dictated by the times. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the Cuban Government is maintaining a continuing campaign of terrorism, sabotage, and subversion throughout Central and South America; and

Whereas there is a direct relationship between free world shipping to Cuba and the transformation of that island into a military base by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas there is a realization among Central and South American nations that the presence of Soviet equipment in Cuba poses a serious threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas 46 ships from outside the Communist bloc have unloaded cargoes in Cuba since the termination of the blockade (November 20, 1963) through January 1, 1963—

That is a little more than 5 weeks—and I do not have the latest figures for January—

and
Whereas the American merchant marine industry has called upon maritime lines throughout the free world to ban the carry-

ing of Soviet cargoes to Cuba and has urged the President to support this embargo: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should direct the Secretary of State to endeavor to make such arrangements as may be possible with the countries of South and Central America to prevent shipments of goods from such countries to Cuba and to extend the economic sanctions voted upon at the Punta del Este Conference to halt all trade with Cuba; and be it further

Resolved, That the President should strenuously support the American merchant marine's efforts to obtain a free world embargo on Soviet shipments to Cuba.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 83), submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Cuban Government is maintaining a continuing campaign of terrorism, sabotage, and subversion throughout Central and South America; and

Whereas there is a direct relationship between free world shipping to Cuba and the transformation of that island into a military base by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas there is a realization among Central and South American Nations that the presence of Soviet equipment in Cuba poses a serious threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas 46 ships from outside the Communist bloc have unloaded cargoes in Cuba since the termination of the blockade (November 20, 1963) through January 1, 1963; and

Whereas the American merchant marine industry has called upon maritime lines throughout the free world to ban the carrying of Soviet cargoes to Cuba and has urged the President to support this embargo: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should direct the Secretary of State to endeavor to make such arrangements as may be possible with the countries of South and Central America to prevent shipments of goods from such countries to Cuba and to extend the economic sanctions voted upon at the Punta del Este conference to halt all trade with Cuba; be it further

Resolved, That the President should strenuously support the American merchant marine's efforts to obtain a free world embargo on Soviet shipments to Cuba.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is in the Chamber. He agreed with us last year on this shipping problem, long before the embargo.

I am sure the resolution will be sent to the Senator's subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it is time that we say to those in the administration and to the American merchant marine and all its people that we will support them on anything they can get done to completely tighten this embargo.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Not only do I find myself in agreement with the distinguished Senator from Washington but also I express keen disappointment over the fact that he overlooked me in respect to co-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1823

lifted after some limited agreements were made; but then nothing was done about the matter—despite the fact that many of these ships are still plying their trade, and now are engaged in the same activities in which they were engaged early this year and during the summer.

However, Mr. President, it is significant to note that Cuba's foreign trade with the free world and with the Soviet-Sino bloc since 1958 has been as follows:

In 1958, the Soviet-Sino bloc supplied Cuba with the comparatively small amount of US\$15 million worth of trade; in 1959, \$15 million worth of trade; in 1960, \$260 million worth of trade; in 1961, \$930 million worth of trade; and in 1962, \$945 million—almost \$1 billion—worth of trade.

So the Soviet-Sino bloc, with its flag-ships and with some ships chartered from the Norwegians and from the United Kingdom—and perhaps even with some which had been built in the United States, increased its trade to Cuba from approximately \$15 million worth in 1958 to \$945 million worth in 1962; and this is a conservative estimate.

To be fair about this matter, it should be pointed out that there have been some results in the free world, because at the same time the following developments occurred:

In 1958, the free world shipping, including our own, contributed to Cuban foreign trade a total of \$1,495 million worth; in 1959, the amount dropped to \$1,310 million worth; in 1960, it dropped to \$860 million worth; in 1961, it dropped to \$315 million worth; and the estimate for 1962 is \$245 million worth.

So we see that to that extent the balance has shifted.

But the latest figures we have show that last year the trade with Cuba from the Soviet-Sino bloc amounted to \$945 million worth, and that from the free world to Cuba amounted to \$245 million worth; and of course that \$245 million worth is too much. Our purpose is to dry it up as much as possible.

So, Mr. President, today—long overdue—the President is supposed to issue, probably the report of it is already on the wires, a revival of an administrative order which will further limit trade between Cuba and the free world. I wish to supplement that order by submitting a letter from Mr. Dutton, the Assistant Secretary of State, to me. The letter was delivered yesterday afternoon, and in it Mr. Dutton states:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Attached is a summary of the shipping orders which were to be put into effect to further limit Cuban trade with the free world. They include the following points:

1. The administrative order applies only to the ship rather than to all vessels of the same line.

2. The order permits a vessel to "purge itself" if the line gives assurance that all vessels under its control will stay out of the Cuban trade.

3. It applies not only to bloc-Cuban trade but to all trade with Cuba.

4. It applies only to cargoes shipped from the United States and will not affect off-shore procurement.

5. By setting the beginning date of January 1, of this year, it avoids penalizing vessels which were previously engaged in the Cuban trade but which have subsequently been removed from that trade.

6. It is an adaptation of the fourth point of the proposed shipping orders which were to have been issued. The balance of the orders have been delayed because of legal problems caused by treaty commitments and obligations with many nations. The other parts of the order are under consideration presently and may be issued in the future if our informal efforts with our allies do not produce the desired result, further isolating Cuba.

Presently, many of the objectives are being met by voluntary compliance on an informal basis with our allies.

If there is anything I can do for you on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER ON SHIPPING TO CUBA

The U.S. Government is about to put into effect the shipping regulation intended to reduce, still further, the amount of nonbloc shipping in the Cuban trade. The effect of the regulation will be modified because of the drastic reduction in free world shipping to Cuba since October 1962. However, pronouncement of the regulation is expected to discourage shippers who withdrew their vessels under the pressure of the October crisis, and prevent their ships from reentering the Cuban trade now that some of the excitement has died down.

The United States appreciates that many free world countries have made efforts to assist the United States by discouraging ships in the Cuban trade, and that shipping has declined since October. Despite this cooperation by our allies, shipping to Cuba, unfortunately, continues. For example, since the end of the U.S. quarantine on November 20, a total of 46 free world ships have arrived at Cuban ports. U.S. official cargo should not be made available to ships engaged in the Cuban trade, and thereby make their trade more profitable. Therefore, it is necessary to issue the following administrative regulations.

The regulations apply to shipments financed by the Department of Agriculture, Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and AID, on foreign-flag ships engaged in the Cuban trade. Such cargoes will not be shipped from the United States on a foreign-flag vessel, if such vessel has called at a Cuban port on or after January 1, 1963. An exception may be made as any such vessel, if the persons who control the vessel, given satisfactory assurances that no ships under their control will be employed in the Cuban trade in the future so long as it remains the U.S. policy to discourage such trade. This order should not be regarded as being in lieu of the Four Point Shipping Actions announced earlier which are still under consideration.

It is interesting to note that the decline in free world trade with Cuba, which began in 1959 has continued and accelerated since the U.S. quarantine. This is shown in the following table.

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Dry cargo.....	75	57	43	54	32	13
Tanker.....	17	7	9	11	6	6

Although comparable confirmed figures are not available for January 1963, the trend in January was continuing.

Free world countries having vessels of their flag under charter to the Soviet bloc in the Cuba trade in recent months have generally included Norway, Sweden, Greece, Lebanon, and the United Kingdom.

Bloc shipping continues at approximately the same rate as in the first 6 months of 1962, or before the missile buildup.

Cuba's foreign trade with the free world and the bloc since 1958 has been as follows:

(Millions of U.S. dollars)

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962 ¹
Bloc.....	15	15	260	930	945
Free world.....	1,495	1,310	860	315	245

¹ Estimated.

The decline in free world shipping to Cuba, and the increase in bloc shipping has in itself caused a drop in free world cargoes for Cuban ports, since the great majority of bloc voyages for Cuba leave from bloc ports and carry bloc cargoes. In the slightly more than 2 months since the quarantine ended there have been a number of reliable reports from Cuba describing that country's increasing isolation from the free world—inability to obtain spare parts for Western-origin machinery, delays in receipt of shipments ordered from the West, lack of transport for shipments to free world countries. In some cases, bloc ships are recently reported to have called at free world ports to pick up cargoes scheduled for Cuba, but these diversions have not been sufficient to compensate for the volume which would be moved if more free world shipping were available.

During January 1963, almost all cargoes arriving at Cuban ports have been of bloc origin. This includes all crude oil and refined petroleum products and the great majority of machinery and equipment.

Mr. President, I address myself briefly to the last point. I repeat it:

The other parts of the order are under consideration presently and may be issued in the future if our informal efforts with our allies do not produce the desired result, further isolating Cuba.

In other words, unless we can convince the rest of the free world that it should join with us in an effort to bring about at least a partial solution of the Cuban problem, we shall have to issue some additional orders.

The President's order will be strong enough. It may now be on the wireless services. It will provide that American ports will be closed to the vessels of any country whose ships carry arms to Cuba, or vice versa.

That order will go part of the way. But what about other countries whose ships do not touch American ports? Many ships of the free world do not ply in the American trade. For example, a ship could sail from a Norwegian or an English port, stop at Cuba, and go down to Buenos Aires or Rio de Janeiro; or it could go through the Panama Canal to the Far East. Many ships follow that route. It is a great trade route of the world. Such ships could then pick up cargo in the Far East or from Red China. Those ships cannot be covered by a Presidential order.

So it is my suggestion that we back up the State Department and the President of the United States. I know that the President and those in the State De-

nations. I have prepared a list of all the ships.

I think it is significant to note that ships flying the flag of Greece accounted for 25 percent of the total number of ships; ships flying the flag of the United Kingdom accounted for 15 percent; ships flying the flag of the German Federal Republic accounted for 12 percent; and ships flying the flag of Norway accounted for 9 percent.

I have a list of 20 free world nations which participated in sending ships to Cuba and were presumably doing business as usual and taking part in the buildup which is now causing the world so much trouble.

This subject was discussed at that time, and on September 20, 1962, as appears on page 19190 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I again made the point. Prior to that time I had sent this record to the State Department and the President of the United States. A copy was also sent to the Department of Defense, which records such information. However, the Department of Defense did not need the information, because much of it came from that Department. It was suggested that the United States place an embargo upon shipping to Cuba because, although that would not solve the entire problem, it would be of great assistance in achieving our objective, with which everyone is now in agreement; namely, to end communism and Castroism in the Western Hemisphere.

On that day I called the subject to the attention of the Senate and to other officials because a group of Italian seamen had refused to load or to sail two supply ships from Italy because they had learned that a part of the cargo was destined for Cuba. At that time a U.S. Department of State employee went to the port involved and suggested that the seamen proceed to load the ship, thus actually interfering in the matter. Finally, he was withdrawn by the State Department, and the cargo was removed from the ship, so that it might sail.

Prior to that time, members of American maritime groups, including both labor and management, had strongly urged that the Government place an embargo at an earlier date on Cuban shipments by American-flag ships and other ships of the free world. As a matter of fact, at an international conference they pressed strenuously for a resolution that seamen of the International Maritime Labor Conference refuse to load any ship flying a free world flag or to unload any ship from a Soviet bloc country which was destined for Cuba and was loading or unloading in free world ports.

Mr. Joseph Curran, the head of the Maritime Union; the Pacific American Steamship Association; the American Maritime Institute; and others associated with management joined in this request. They also criticized the Department of Agriculture, which had control over bookings on foreign-flag ships carrying surplus commodity cargoes, in the hope that such nations would make their regulations more stringent.

On September 18, Mr. Ralph D. Dewey, president of the Pacific-American

Steamship Association, sent to the President of the United States a long telegram, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully suggest an unprovocative method available to you to discipline foreign-flag merchant ships which persist in trading with Cuba.

Suggest Presidential instructions to responsible Government agencies to resume control over ocean transportation of Public Law 480 and other similar cargoes which are lifted on foreign-flag vessels for the purpose of stopping bookings on any foreign vessels which have recently traded with Cuba or Red China. No such authority or control now exists. Responsible agencies should be required to be furnished with names of vessels recently trading with Cuba and be given authority to disapprove charters or use of such vessels for carrying foreign aid or surplus cargoes.

This would at least bring to a halt our Government's aiding and abetting those shipowners abroad who refuse to stop their profiteering with our declared enemies.

We fully support efforts of State Department to seek voluntary prohibitions by negotiation with NATO countries. As constituent member of International Chamber of Shipping, we join with our east coast colleagues in trying to get voluntary withdrawal of free world shipowners from these nefarious trades. Also, we are asking American ship brokers to stop acting as agents for vessels which trade with countries such as Cuba and Red China.

But, we are skeptical of early voluntary results and the situation calls for use now of governmental authority already available.

Action your part to stop American largesse to these profiteers will deter many foreign owners from further Cuba and Red China trade, since U.S. surplus cargoes too good to give up. It will also serve notice to all maritime nations that the 50-percent carriage of our foreign aid cargoes which foreign-flag vessels now enjoy by statute is a congressionally sanctioned privilege, not a vested international right. Also, this privilege has a price in terms of keeping the peace which is at least equal to that which American shipowners are paying.

It is paradox that Treasury ruling T-1 and T-2 of December 1950 should prohibit U.S.-flag vessels from ever again calling at U.S. ports if they trade with Red China and Cuba and, at the same time, it permits foreign-flag vessels to call here under same circumstances. Would ask that T-1 and T-2 be amended to stop any vessels of a foreign owner who allows any of his ships to trade with Cuba and Red China from calling at U.S. ports to lift any cargo—commercial or governmental. At the very least, however, such vessels should not be allowed to carry Government-sponsored grain or other cargo.

When you were member of Senate Investigations Subcommittee, the records in the 1955 hearings on China trade showed several hundred European-flag vessels were concurrently enjoying both China trade and the lucrative U.S. aid cargoes. No success in calling halt then but the power to do so is now in your hands.

Am taking liberty of furnishing copies of this communication to Secretaries of State, Defense, Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture.

RALPH B. DEWEY,
President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the telegram Mr. Dewey pointed out that at that time the State Department had begun to seek a voluntary arrangement with the associated companies, in hopes that they would join—not only those on the east coast, but also on the gulf coast and also those on the west coast—in the endeavor to end this trade.

I now read part of the telegram:

Also, we are asking American ship brokers to stop acting as agents for vessels which trade with countries such as Cuba and Red China.

Prior to the blockade, the State Department did begin to take some action, and made some attempts—the Secretary of State himself did, I believe—to get these free world countries to stop that trade and to join in this crusade and this worldwide embargo by the free world on shipments to Cuba. I must say that the Secretary of State obtained some results. The German Federation agreed that it would take steps to do that. Great Britain and Norway rather dragged their heels, and used the excuse that many of the ships which were going to Cuba were under charter, and that they had no legal right to call them back. Also, the State Department was hampered—I must say, in all fairness—by maritime multilateral and unilateral agreements with many countries which had to be considered before a decision could be made.

That went on a long time; but I point this out to the Senate, in order to suggest that the American merchant marine and those operating American-flag ships not only were alert to that situation, but also had strenuously suggested and insisted—months and months before the blockade—that the whole free world do something about that matter. It also had some economic aspects, because American-flag ships were being prohibited from stopping or discharging cargo or picking up cargo in Cuba and coming to American ports; but we found that other ships could do that.

I also communicated with the State Department—and I made a statement about this matter to the members of my committee—in hopes that all of us would back up the Secretary of State and the President of the United States and in hopes that we could achieve this goal—long before there was any evidence of an offensive armaments buildup. Of course, some of the foreign-flag vessels have been doing some doubledealing in regard to this matter. At that time I said it was bad enough to deny a privilege to American-flag ships, but it was unthinkable to allow these foreign ships to serve the cause of communistic Cuba and still take business from vessels of the United States or from vessels of powers friendly to the United States. At that time we called upon the President to take the necessary steps, if possible, to do something about that matter.

All of us know that since then, evidence of a buildup of offensive weapons in Cuba has been obtained, and that buildup has been proven, and the President did slap a blockade upon all shipments into Cuba. The blockade was

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1821

spearhead the eventual overthrow of the Castro regime.

It has restrained Cuban refugee groups seeking to continue harassing attacks on Castro's fortress.

There is no indication that it is supplying or helping build anti-Castro guerrilla forces inside Cuba. Nor are there signs that it is making more than a casual attempt to urge other hemispheric nations to bring increased diplomatic pressure on Cuba.

In short, from all outward signs, the Kennedy administration is sitting still while Fidel builds his monument, a memorial not only to Bay of Pigs but to the failure of the United States to face up to its responsibilities.

The points raised by this editorial are vital ones which deserve the close attention of this body and definitive action by the administration. I am most hopeful that the investigation now being launched by Senator STENNIS' Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigating will be effective in correcting the unfortunate situation which now exists. I have been able to supply this subcommittee with some pertinent information, and I will continue to support its work in every possible way. I strongly hope, and I urge, that the executive department will be completely helpful and frank with Senator STENNIS and the other able members of his subcommittee and that early publicity may be given to all of the facts which can be established. My people, and the people of the Nation, in general, are entitled to know what the facts are, and not to be left to choose between the conflicting statements and rumors which now plague them.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "U.S. Public in Dark on Cuba," published in the Panama City News-Herald of Sunday, February 3, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. PUBLIC IN DARK ON CUBA

The Kennedy administration is screaming "foul" over pressure for a thorough investigation into negotiations between the United States and Russia over Soviet missiles in Cuba, claiming demands for a probe are only partisan efforts to discredit the Democratic regime.

Crux of the matter is the removal of American intermediate range missiles from bases in Italy and Turkey concurrent with an apparent buildup of Russian military strength in Cuba. Far from being partisan, demands for more information on the problem are being made by both Republicans and Democrats.

The administration has issued the explanation that its Jupiter missiles are being removed from Italy and Turkey because they are now somewhat obsolete and not needed, that the Polaris submarines can do a better job.

However, the respected London Times has commented that the planned withdrawal of U.S. Jupiter missiles from bases in Italy and Turkey shows that "President Kennedy is prepared to carry out what Mr. Khrushchev demanded as the price of removing Soviet missiles from Cuba."

Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Wyoming, Republican, went on record last week with the statement that President Kennedy is ful-

filling his part of a secret bargain with Khrushchev.

Meanwhile many voices in both the Senate and the House are warning sternly that Russia is continuing to build up a powerful military machine in Cuba. It is constantly adding both men and equipment to turn the island into a tremendous fortress just 90 miles away from the United States.

Americans are not content with the President's contention that the Red military machine in Cuba is purely defensive in nature. For, the same guns, tanks, planes and short-range missiles that would be effective in defense would also prove deadly on offense.

As of now, the public has no inkling of what promises or pledges, if any, were contained in the now famous exchange of letters between Kennedy and Khrushchev. The public has no idea of what is now the Nation's foreign policy.

However, the public can still add. It can add the mounting military buildup in Cuba to the awakening of NATO defenses in Italy and Turkey to the antagonism of France and Canada to the United States to the growing preoccupation of the administration with the Congo and other backward African nations.

All these add up to "trouble" and the Nation has a right to know fully what the trouble is, who is largely responsible for increasing difficulties and what feasible solutions exist.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, these two editorials, one of which I have quoted in part, and one which I have inserted in full in the RECORD, express the feelings shown by almost every newspaper within my State.

I believe that the task now confronting the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and his subcommittee is one in which they can, and I am sure will, render a very great service to all our people. I urge strongly that the executive department not withhold, either on the ground of executive privilege or any other ground, facts which are basic to the determination of just what our situation is in that troubled area.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am pleased to hear the Senator's statement that he had some information and some facts which he is presenting to the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and that he would be glad to do what he can to furnish the committee whatever he receives from other sources along that line.

I wonder if the Senator does not believe that, so long as he is accepting his responsibility in this matter, that the same suggestion should be made to other Members of Congress who may have information.

Mr. HOLLAND. I assume that all Members of Congress will gladly supply to this able subcommittee, headed by one of our most distinguished Members, any information within their possession. I shall certainly do so. I do it not in an effort to sidestep any responsibility of mine, but because I do not have available any means by which I can determine the facts from the contrasting or contrary statements being made, and because I realize that this committee will be given, by the Senate, any personnel

and any facilities that it may feel to be necessary.

I am sure that all Members of the Senate will take that same position. I thank the Senator for asking that question.

MERCHANT SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is no secret in geography that Cuba is an island and that to sustain any military force in that area a supply line must come by water or by air, but mainly by water.

In July and August of last year, many Senators, including the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS] and me, and members of the Committee on Commerce, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, particularly Senators who are active in merchant marine affairs, called attention to the fact that a part of our action to stop the spread of Castroism and all that it entails, or at least to contain it in some degree, should be to place not only an embargo on shipping, but also other kinds of embargoes which would affect Cuba.

At that time I did research on the subject and secured all the information which was then available, some of it even classified, as to the number of ships which were stopping in Cuba, and the extent to which free world shipping was participating in Cuban trade. Besides the number of ships which were then engaging in Cuban trade, I secured information concerning the flags they flew and many other items, which I shall not place in the RECORD, because I referred to it last year either in August or early September.

Suffice to say that during a specified period in June 1962, prior to the missile buildup, or during the time of the missile buildup, a total of 169 merchant ships, including 28 tankers, flying the flags of 20 free world countries, made a total of 185 trips to Cuba. Ships flying the flags of Greece, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Norway accounted for 61 percent of the total number of ships involved, or 71 percent of the total trips to Cuba.

At the time the United States was engaged in the controversy, struggle, or enterprise—whatever one wishes to call it—to contain what is now existent in Cuba, 169 ships flying the flags of countries of the free world, countries which presumably are joined with us in this effort—at least, they say so—in that 2 months period alone, made a total of 185 trips, accounting for 71 percent of the total number of trips made to Cuba.

No ship flying the U.S. flag called at Cuban ports at any time during that period or long prior thereto, except in one or two rare exceptions for the hauling of medical supplies or the evacuation of people, and also excepting ships going to Guantanamo Bay. But the number of free world ships in the Cuban trade prior to the blockade of last fall and the number of trips by such ships to Cuba during that period were almost double the comparable figures for ships of Soviet bloc

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1819

THE DODD-COOPER EQUAL VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Washington Evening Star under the caption "The Right To Vote," which comments on the Dodd-Cooper equal voting rights bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

President Kennedy has said that literacy tests to determine whether a person is qualified to vote are iniquitous. But this is not necessarily so.

What may be and, indeed, what doubtless has been iniquitous is the discriminatory manner in which literacy tests have been given in some States. When a double standard is maintained, one for whites and one for colored people, the result clearly is an unconstitutional form of discrimination.

This evil can be removed, however, without resort to Federal legislative devices which are of doubtful constitutionality in their own right, and which prescribe an arbitrary but often meaningless test of literacy. One of these is the administration's proposal last year that a sixth grade education be fixed as conclusive proof of literacy for voting purposes. If voting is thought of as a responsibility as well as a privilege, very few sixth graders of our acquaintance have the desirable qualifications. And certainly it is absurd to contend that all of them have. Some can barely read and write.

The only argument which can be made for this administration project is one of expediency. It would make it easier to enforce the right to vote of qualified persons who might otherwise be discriminated against. But the expedient way is seldom the best. And we think that there is more to be said for the remedy suggested by Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, and Senator Cooper, Republican, of Kentucky.

They have introduced a bill which would prohibit literacy tests in any election for a Federal office unless (a) the same practices are followed in administering and grading the tests of all individuals, (b) the test is given in writing, or the questions and answers are transcribed verbatim, and, (c) upon request, a certified true copy of the questions and answers given is furnished to the individual within 30 days. Their bill also provides that immaterial errors shall not be used to deny the right to vote.

It seems to us that there is much to recommend this bill. It does not attempt to prevent the States from using literacy tests, provided only that they are fairly and impartially administered. And it has a reasonable chance of being enacted by this Congress.

HONORARY CITIZENSHIP FOR WINSTON CHURCHILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier in the session I introduced, for the consideration of this body, Senate Joint Resolution 3, which would confer honorary citizenship of this Republic on Winston Churchill of Great Britain.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROVER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] may be added as cosponsors.

It is gratifying to have the cooperation of these colleagues in this meaningful matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN WITNESSES TO TESTIFY IN THE CASE OF THE U.S. v. THOMAS H. KEEGAN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the resolution (S. Res. 82).

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I make this brief explanation. The U.S. attorney in Chicago, Ill., has requested the attendance in court of two witnesses who were temporarily members of the staff of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, so they may testify in the criminal case referred to in the resolution, which is pending in the court to which the resolution refers.

This is the usual, customary resolution which is adopted by the Senate in these cases.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. We have been working under a gentlemen's agreement that we would not transact business because of the situation with regard to the rules. I have no objection to what the Senator from Arkansas is suggesting, if he could protect the situation on the floor so that it would not affect the present controversy on the rules.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What situation did the Senator intend to protect? I understood I had unanimous consent. If not—

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not desire to interfere at all with the Senator from Arkansas. We started off at one time to discuss a situation in which it was stated that no business was to be transacted. We have transacted certain items of business. I ask unanimous consent that whatever action is taken on the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas shall not prejudice in any way the parliamentary situation on the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I join in that request. I thought that was understood. I join in that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that business has previously been transacted, and all Members should be on notice to that effect. A like resolution submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] was agreed to without any such reservation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not seek to prejudice anyone's rights. I simply thought it was a matter which should be attended to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 82) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the case of the *United States of America v. Thomas H. Keegan*, Criminal Action No. 61-Cr-487, is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division; and

Whereas the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois has requested that Carl M. Schultz and Gerald G. Gotsch, former staff members of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, appear as witnesses during the trial of the aforementioned case; and

Whereas the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois has requested certain documents of the said former Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field to be used in connection with the aforementioned proceeding; and

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, has in its possession, by virtue of S. Res. 255, section 5, Eighty-sixth Congress, the files and records of the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, including those requested by the said United States attorney in connection with the aforementioned criminal proceeding; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate of the United States no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate or processes of the ordinary courts of justice be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; and

Whereas by the privilege of the Senate and by rule XXX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no document shall be withdrawn from its files except by the order of the Senate; and

Whereas information secured by the staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees of the Senate may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Carl M. Schultz and Gerald G. Gotsch, former staff members of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field be authorized to appear and testify at the aforementioned proceeding; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations is authorized to comply with the aforesaid requests and deliver the requested documents in the possession of the said committee to the said United States attorney for use in the aforementioned proceeding.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission for the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations to file reports concerning last year's work after January 31, 1963, which is the deadline under Senate Resolution 250.

There are three reports which involve the Department of Agriculture handling of pooled cotton allotments of Billie Sol

1820

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 6

Estes, pyramiding of profits and costs in the missile procurement program and American Guild of Variety Artists. These reports have been drafted and will be submitted very soon to the committee for study. I ask for a delay until the first of April in order that adequate consideration may be given to the reports by the committee members.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the name of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 537) amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, submitted by me on January 25, 1963. Together with the original cosponsors, there are now 76 Senators who have joined with me in the introduction of this important and urgently needed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, on February 4, 1963, entitled "Time To Modernize," in support of this bill, be incorporated in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TIME TO MODERNIZE

Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, is supported by 75 other Senators, three-fourths of the membership of that Chamber, in sponsoring legislation to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget. The merit of the proposal is obvious, and, in fact, the need is great. It is not a partisan project, and on five previous occasions the Senate has approved similar legislation. In all cases, the House has declined to follow suit.

The function of such a committee, in brief, would be to coordinate and simplify the consideration of appropriation requests from the executive branch and to improve congressional surveillance over the expenditure of public funds. It is astonishing that such objectives, or any thoughtful proposals for attaining them, could be narrowly controversial. They have been, largely because of the point of view of the House, based upon custom and its own interpretation of the Constitution, that all money legislation must originate in that branch. In practice, as a consequence, both branches have held separate appropriation committee hearings and in other ways have operated so independently as to involve duplication of effort, waste of time and, in the end, excess of appropriations and a waste of money. The day of \$100 billion Federal budgets is at hand and errors in budget "guesstimating" involve increasingly greater sums of money—usually on the deficit side, and this with the national debt moving constantly higher.

Authorization for the joint budget committee procedure exists in law, in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, but has never been implemented. The McClellan bill proposes it on a streamlined and workable basis, starting with a 14-member committee that would be made up of 7 mem-

bers from the appropriations committees from each branch. The most useful feature, however, would be the creation of a professional technical staff such as that which has functioned with unquestioned success in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. On tax legislation, this system has not led to any infringement of the rights and privileges of each branch of Congress. There is no reason to believe it would do so on appropriation measures. It is time for Congress to update its method of dealing with the public funds. The plan offered by Senator McClellan and his associates is a good way to start.

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be added as a cosponsor to S. 178, commonly known as the Garrison diversion unit measure, at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire to have his request put to the Senate, in view of the fact that other business has been transacted from time to time, since the very first day, without any special reservation?

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wanted to have the Record clear that we were not prejudicing the situation which exists.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the very serious problem of the relationship of the United States with the Cuba of Fidel Castro, and quite possibly the Cuba of Nikita Khrushchev.

At the moment there is decided disagreement within the Government itself as to the exact status of the Russian military buildup in Cuba. This apparent lack of adequate military and diplomatic intelligence is dangerous to every American. It particularly troubles the citizens of my State since Florida is in the geographical position of being just 90 miles, less than 10 minutes by jet aircraft, from the site upon which a shooting war might possibly erupt.

But this on-target position is only a part of the problem. Ever since, for the first time in history, the United States became a "country of first refuge," Florida and its citizens have borne the brunt of the refugee problem. For more than 2 years the people of my State have carried the principal load created by a problem not of our making. While we have been more than glad to perform with the typically humane and generous behavior that marks the average American in extending all possible assistance to unfortunate refugees, Florida would welcome accelerated relocation of refugees to other parts of the country. Secondly, its citizens would like to have the assurance of protection from imminent attack which can come only through possession of accurate and timely mili-

tary intelligence plus an immediate return to the firm policy invoked by the President last fall which gave us then some feeling of security.

The lead editorial in the Monday, February 4 edition of the Tampa Tribune, one of my State's great daily newspapers, contains strong and needed words on this subject from which I would like to quote at this time. Before doing so, however, let me say that the Tribune has always taken a bipartisan attitude on national affairs and is not a habitual critic of either the Democratic Party or the present administration. Most importantly, Tribune editorials almost invariably reflect the thinking of large numbers of its many thousands of readers.

In an editorial entitled "A Monument to Failure" the Tribune stated, in part:

Fidel Castro has turned up in a new role. As a patron of the arts, he has scraped up \$15,000 in prize money and has invited architects the world over to submit designs for a \$2 million monument commemorating the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion.

When it is completed it will stand not only as a memorial to the Bay of Pigs fiasco but as one to the miserable failure of the United States to deal effectively with what now has become an entrenched Communist bridgehead in the Western Hemisphere.

Despite White House denials that there has been a recent Soviet "military influx" into Cuba evidence accumulates that the Russians are continuing to strengthen their Cuban arsenal and that the United States is doing nothing about it.

While the Pentagon and State Department shrug off such reports, they are largely supported by stories of refugees coming out of Cuba who say that both Russian troops and arms continue to pour into the island.

One might feel more confidence in the Government's intelligence reports had not their shortcomings been evident during the missile buildup last fall.

Defense Secretary McNamara told a congressional committee late last week that the Russian missiles were secretly loaded and transported to Cuba in the holds of large Soviet ships.

"Since all the strategic missile-associated equipment, such as erectors and transporters, and the missiles themselves were concealed in the holds of the ships and unloaded under the cover of darkness, and under most stringent Soviet-controlled security restrictions, photographic surveillance at the time was unable to discover the initial introduction of offensive missiles into Cuba."

How can the Pentagon be so certain that the same technique is not now being employed to smuggle arms and perhaps missiles into Cuba?

Even if Pentagon estimates are accepted, we know that there are 17,000 or more Soviet troops in Cuba. We know that the Soviet arsenal contains a wide variety of ground-to-air missiles, all manner of tanks, artillery, trucks, ammunition, patrol boats and approximately 150 fighter planes.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk concedes "a significant Soviet military presence in Cuba which is of great concern to the United States." But the Kennedy administration is doing precious little to relieve this concern.

It has failed to put into effect the regulations, drawn before last fall's showdown with Russia, designed to strangle Cuba's economic life by curtailing shipping.

It has done no more than express interest in a proposal by Costa Rica for the establishment of a Cuban government-in-exile to